



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/529,757	03/30/2005	Tomonari Yomoda	Q87211	1590

23373 7590 06/30/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

MCELHENY JR, DONALD E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2857

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2/

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/529,757	Applicant(s) YOMODA ET AL.	
	Examiner Donald E. McElheny, Jr.	Art Unit 2857	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</p> <p>2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</p> <p>3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/30/05; 01/04/06</u>.</p> | <p>4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.</p> <p>5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</p> <p>6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.</p> |
|--|--|

1. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. PCT/JP04/11818, filed 08/18/2004, and to Application No. Japan 2003-302633, filed 08/27/2003. A reference to the prior application(s) must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365(c). See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications. If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by

Art Unit: 2857

a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional. The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

If the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78(a), but not in the first sentence(s) of the specification or an application data sheet (ADS) as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a) (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a) and the surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t) are not required. Applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is over 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

3. The following is a quotation of the second and fourth paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 2857

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Subject to the following paragraph, a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.

4. Claims 6-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention, and under 112 fourth paragraph, as being an improper dependent claim.

These claims are not drawn to the subject matter of their parent claim and then further restrict such, but are drawn to a different combination that then includes features of the mentioned parent claim. They appear to be intended to even be drawn to a different statutory invention class under 101 or possibly even different and restrictable invention altogether. Claims such as 6-13 become entirely nebulous and indefinite as to exactly what is even intended to be covered by the claims.

5. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-5, and 13-15 have their preamble directed to a method. However, the bodies of the claims recite desired results, desired relationships of data, yet fail to clearly and positively set forth method steps. Therefore it is indefinite what steps are intended in the method claims as to be the invention and its intended coverage.

Dependent claims 6-12 are addressed supra. Since they are dependent upon the method claim their structural limitations should not necessarily be given patentable

weight, nor treated further on the merits. The system per se is restrictable as a distinct invention as it appears to have 2-way distinctness, or at least the method can be applied to other systems, and the system limitations combination of claim 6, if they were properly set forth as an independent claim, could be used with other methods.

All claims further state in their preambles the invention as directed to provide earthquake prediction. Yet the bodies of the claims are not positively supportive of such end desired result. The claims therefore appear to be incomplete, and indefinite how and when the earthquake prediction desired result is met. Because the necessary end result lacks support, the claims are further incomplete and indefinite how they meet the statutory criteria for 101. See the following remarks.

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter and the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

Please be advised that the "Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Subject Matter Eligibility" was signed on Oct 26, 2005 and posted on the uspto.gov website. The link is:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ogsheet.html>

Also see MPEP 2106, which covers computer implemented inventions and the manner in which they may be claimed and find statutory basis under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The claims do not recite any requirement of computer implementation. However, even if there were such claimed basis, they would still fail to meet the latest Guidelines criteria for having statutory basis. All claims fail to meet the minimal requirement of a useful, concrete and tangible result of a real physical world interactive end result supported by any algorithm steps, or structure supporting such calculated step, where the end result limitation/data supports the invention of predicting an earthquake.

8. The IDS submissions dated 03/30/05 and 01/04/06 have been received and considered. However, copies of citations in the latter were never received.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

11. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over any of the references to either Helms (5148110) or Park (6307375 B1).

As far as can be determined from the grossly indefinite claims, these references teach claimed inventive features which can be given patentable weight, and from the knowledge of one skilled in the art that sees that the method of monitoring electromagnetic field lines of the earth, and as taught the telluric fields/currents that are known correlations to the earth's magnetic field observations, and comparing the differences that occur in such are indicative of occurring, as well as impending, seismic related events such as earthquakes, and can be used to predict earthquakes.

12. Other prior art cited also is pertinent to teaching use of earth's electromagnetic fields and variations for monitoring of and predicting seismic events.


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donald McElheny, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-2218. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoff Marc, can be reached on weekdays at telephone number 571-272-2216. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 2857

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Donald E. McElheny, Jr.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2857